F 44.6
C 4755

FROM THE LIBRARY OF

REV. LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D. D.

BEQUEATHED BY HIM TO

THE LIBRARY OF

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SCD
2613

Division

Section

Church Music

From
The Edinburgh Review.
January 1852.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/churchmusicrevie00unse

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
DEC 5 1932
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW.

No. CXCIII.

FOR JANUARY, 1852.

---

were rarely corrupt. A few years earlier, this vast mass of legislation would have been jobbed; but a purer public morality has grown up at least in this respect, and the vigilance of Parliament had sought to devise safeguards against corruption. The Legislature has been blamed for neglecting to assist private enterprise by the organisation of a more complete system of railway communication, and for permitting the ruinous contests which arose between competing companies. It may be doubted, however, whether the country would have submitted to the active interposition of the Government in matters of private enterprise, and to the discouragement of rivalry among capitalists. The experiment was tried in 1844, and very signally failed. If such a system had been successful, it is true that considerable expense and confusion might have been saved; but should we have had as many railways? or is there any reason to believe that they would have been more ably designed or better managed than by private companies acting under Government control?

Such, then, have been the parliamentary labours of the period which we have selected for illustration. We are already enjoying the fruits which they have borne; and the future is full of promise. The seed has been sown, and the harvest will be gathered. Many of our laws are still imperfectly developed; but their principles are sound,—the objects are admitted to be good,—and they will not be suffered to remain without expansion. A principle once recognised, is sure to be carried out, sooner or later, to its legitimate conclusion; and we should rejoice over modern legislation, if it were only for its practical adoption of scientific institutions are found to be susceptible of improvement. Reform has been discovered not to be revolution. On the other hand, we perceive indications of a more temperate spirit on the part of ultra-reformers. They have seen public opinion represented without universal suffrage; they have acknowledged the excellence of many of our laws, although the constitution of Parliament may not be theoretically perfect; and they have felt that great interests, however strong in political influence, have been surrendered for the sake of the unrepresented classes. By wise, liberal, and humane legislation, the statesmen of our time have almost cut the ground from under the feet of the Radical Reformers; but they may not yet rest from their labours, and exclaim, 'The work is done.' Few fundamental changes, it is true, remain to be made. The completion of changes already commenced,—the extension of principles already acknowledged,—and the more perfect organisation of our laws,—these will be the requirements of the next ten years; and if they be met with judgment and an honest purpose, much honour and gratitude are still in store for public men.

ART. IV.—1. *The whole Booke of Psalmes, with their wonted Tunes, as they are sang in Churches, composed into Foure Parts.* 1592. Reprinted for the Members of the Musical Antiquarian Society, and edited by E. F. RIMBAULT, LL.D., F.S.A.

2. *The whole Booke of Psalmes, with the Hymnes Evangelical and Songs Spiritual,*

LIBRARY OF PRINCE DEC 1932

composed into Four Parts by sundry Authors, &c. Edited by the Rev. W. H. Havergal, M.A. London: 1845.

3. *The People's Music Book, Part I., consisting of a Selection of Psalm Tunes, in Four Parts, with an arrangement for the Organ or Piano Forte.* Edited by James Turle, Organist of Westminster Abbey, and Edward Taylor, Professor of Music in Gresham College. London: 1844.

There are periodical ebullitions of zeal among the English people for the furtherance of divers worthy purposes; most of which may have been constantly within their view for a succession of years without exciting much attention. On a sudden, however, one or more of them assumes an air of importance, and becomes an object of general conversation; the press, perhaps the pulpit, takes it up—the bell-wethers lead—the flock instinctively follow, and a subject which had scarcely been of sufficient consequence to interest a parish, all at once interests a nation. Such has been the case with regard to that portion of the worship of God which is performed by the aid of music. After more than a century of patient acquiescence in the single drawl of a clerk, or the unisonous squall of a row of charity children, we seem to have awakened to the conviction that this is not music, and that still less can it act as a help or incentive to devotion. The necessity of some change must be considered to be admitted on all sides, when every body agrees that 'whatever is, is wrong.' Nevertheless, to what extent, and in what way the change shall be effected, all sorts of discordant opinions are afloat, from the want of clear and distinct notions of either the purpose in view, or the proper means of attaining it. This arises from the ignorance of persons, whom, unfortunately, that ignorance has not prevented from at once twaddling and dogmatising, nor from exercising considerable influence over the public.

If music formed a part of the education of the English people,—if even the clergy were 'mediocriter docti in plano cantu,'—this could not happen; or if they acted upon Burke's wise resolve, that 'where he did not see his way clearly he would tread cautiously,' the efforts we may make would be made in one and the same direction, all tending to a certain definite end, and all adopting the best and surest means. But as our musical reformers are destitute, for the most part, of any knowledge on the subject, either historical, theoretical, or practical, the questions,—whether our efforts at amendment will be made in the right or the wrong direction, as well as whether the object which is sought to be attained can, or even ought to, be accomplished, are likely to be settled by pure accident, or something very little better. We would willingly throw a little light upon the point in debate, by considering it with reference to history, to authority, and to utility. It will be found, we think, that history and authority clearly show what are the modes and forms in which music can be fitly employed in devotional service; though at present they are perpetually confounded, in equal disregard of rule and of good taste.

Music, as a part of public worship, is either performed by a choir distinct from the congregation, or by the congregation themselves, or by both alternately.

The former was the practice in the Jewish Temple, where also originated the antiphonal chant,—a method of singing which then, as now, required two choirs, each in itself complete, and separate from the congregation. (Nehem. xii.) Whatever were the musical attainments of the 'men singers and the women singers,' they are constantly mentioned as a separate body, towards whom the Rabbi stood in the situation now occupied by the Precentor in our cathedrals.* 'And David was clothed with a robe of fine linen, and all the Levites that bare the ark, and the singers, and Chenaniah, the master of the song, with the singers.' (1 Chron. xv. 25.) The two hemistichs of each verse were sung by the opposite choirs or by the Precentor-Rabbi and the choir; the whole assembly, at the end of the Psalm at least, (Hallelujah, Amen!) often replacing the choir. That the singing was alternate is clear from the structure or parallelism of many of the Psalms, and also from the Hebrew verb עָנָה, usually translated 'to sing,' but sometimes, 'to sing responsively.' Thus, in Ezra, iii. 11., 'And they sang together by course, in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord,' &c. For the transmission of the alternate chorus from the Jewish Church to the Christian, Lowth, in his Nineteenth Lecture on Hebrew Poetry, quotes the early authority of Pliny's Letters; and that of Bingham for its continuance in the latter Church from the first ages.

To this Psalmody, towards the close of the sixth century, about 590, Gregory the Great adapted the eight tones of the Greek music—an accidental improvement upon the Jewish recitatives. But a new element had been previously introduced by Ambrose into the Western Church at Milan. This was

* 'Quem nos Cantorem nunc a cantando vocamus, vel Choragum, quasi caput Chori.—Kircher, Musurgia, p. 58.

the Hymn or Metrical Song, and its date is from about A. D. 380. Some of these Ambrosian hymns, together with their original tunes, are still preserved, and are traceable by Vatican and German MSS. up to the time of Charlemagne. The Gentile Christians from the first had been acquainted with the Greek music. It consisted of three highly cultivated systems, of the simplest of which (the diatonic or two simple tetrachords) they availed themselves in forming the 'octo toni ecclesiæ.' The original tunes to the Ambrosian hymns are all composed in one of the modes of the diatonic system, and they were sung by the whole congregation.

Under these circumstances there was for a time choir singing and congregational singing. Both would flourish together. The hymns were congregational; while choir music was the old Hebrew element of Psalmody in its proper sense. But even here the Christian impulse led to giving a part to the congregation. Thus in the *Te Deum laudamus* the whole congregation sang the responses in Augustin's time. But a century or two later Christendom and Christian worship underwent a serious trasformation. As the Dark Ages set in, and the hierarchical system became complete by the appointment of *Canonici*, congregational hymn-singing during the service was dropped altogether, and the *Canonici* became the substitutes for the congregation. The choir or chancel, by which the persons who officiated in theservice were separated from the general assembly, was an invention of mediæval architecture, corresponding with this change.

Choir music had been long a favourite art in great ecclesiastical establishments, and was now certain of being more devoutly and professionally encouraged than ever. From its first admission into Christianity England had taken its place in the cultivation of sacred music along with the rest of the Western World. Choirs were formed* and endowed in our cathedrals, provision was made for their instruction, and priests were taught to sing. 'Pope Gregory I. founded and endowed a school at Rome, in which children were instructed in reading, singing, and good morals: from this school those were taken, when well accomplished for it, who were to perform the musical part of the service in public.'* 'Paulinus,' says Bede, 'leaving York and returning to Rochester, left behind him one James, a priest, who, when that province had peace, and the number of the faithful increased, being very skilful in ecclesiastical song, began to teach many to sing after the way of Rome or Canterbury.'† 'Gerbertus Fontinellensis,‡ Airnardus Divensis,§ and Durandus Troarnensis,‖ like three radiant stars in the firmament of heaven, so shone these three Abbots in the citadel of Jehovah. To the fervour of devotion and the warmth of charity they added the possession of various kinds of knowledge, continually thirsting after the service of God in his holy temple. Among those who were best skilled in the art of music they excelled; especially in singing and chanting the sweetly-sounding antiphons and responses. They gave forth, springing from pure hearts, melodious praises of the Almighty King, whom cherubim and seraphim and all the host of heaven adore,—of the holy Virgin Mary, the mother of our Saviour; and carefully taught the boys of the church to sing in concert to the Lord, with Asaph and Eman, Ethun and Idithum, and the sons of Chore.'¶ At every period the extent of the choir must of course every where have varied with the provision which had been given or bequeathed for its support. In England, for instance, the twenty-four vicars of Exeter Cathedral were incorporated in 1194. The choir of Durham at the time of the Reformation consisted of twelve minor canons, a deacon and subdeacon, ten clerks (either priests or laymen), ten choristers (boys) and

* Nothing, however, approaching to the splendid establishments of David. The account, 1 Chron. xxiii., supposes music and poetry to have been in a most flourishing state. 'By him no less than four thousand singers or musicians were appointed from among the Levites, under two hundred and eighty-eight principal singers or leaders of the band, and distributed into twenty-four companies, who officiated weekly by rotation in the Temple, and whose whole business was to perform the sacred hymns: the one part chanting or singing, and the other playing upon different instruments. The chief of these were Asaph, Heman, and Iduthum, who also, as we may presume from the titles of the Psalms, were composers of hymns.' After this, Lowth may well observe on the original dignity and grandeur of the Hebrew Ode; and Milton must have admitted that the quire was worthy in its amplitude of those 'frequent songs throughout the law and prophets,' which he held 'incomparable,' not in 'their divine argument alone, but in the very critical art of composition, over all the kinds of lyric poetry.'

* Dorrington's (Rev. Theo.) Discourse on Singing in the Worship of God (1704), p. 182.

† Beda, Histor. lib. ii. chap. 20. (quoted by Dean Comber).

‡ The Benedictine abbey of Fontenelle, or St. Wandrille, in the diocese of Rouen, founded by Wandresigillas in the seventh century.

§ The Benedictine abbey of St. Pierre sur Dive, founded by Lucellina, wife of William, Count of Eu, 'super rivulum Divæ,' in the diocese of Lisieux.

‖ The Benedictine abbey of Troarn, in the diocese of Bayeux.

¶ This passage of Odericus Vitalis is taken from Baron Maseres's Historiæ Anglicanæ selecta Monumenta, p. 281.

their master. The Lincoln choir in the reign of Edward III. comprised the precentor, four priest vicars, eight lay vicars, an organist, eight (boy) choristers, and seven chanters added and endowed by Bartholomew Lord Burghersh. More specific instances are unnecessary; we may state generally, that the number of the choir ranged, in different cathedral and collegiate churches, from twenty to fifty; that an ample revenue had been appropriated for their maintenance; that, after the example of Pope Gregory I., a grammar-school was attached to every cathedral, where the boys received such musical as well as classical instruction as qualified them for more advanced stations, clerical or lay, in the choir; and that the duties of every member of such a choir were accurately and distinctly defined. The funds which had been set apart for this purpose in any particular establishment survived the Reformation wherever the establishment itself survived. In case they should have subsequently disappeared, the lovers of cathedral music may probably in time hear of something to their advantage through the agency of Mr. Whiston and his pamphlet on 'Cathedral Trusts and their Fulfilment.'

The Reformation would of course find the musical part of the Church service in much the same condition on the Continent as in England,—the congregation equally excluded. On inquiring to whom we are indebted for that class of sacred music which is now distinguished by the share the congregation has in its performance, Roehlitz refers to 'the compositions of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, and to the hymns and tunes of the United Brethren.' But the decided reaction waited for the authority of Luther and Calvin. Both were bent on bringing back the congregation as active parties in this portion of the service. They differed only in the form of doing it,—Luther preferring hymns composed not by Jews but Christians, Calvin preferring metrical translations of the Psalms; and this has since been the constant difference between the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches over the Continent, though now in Germany and Holland the Calvinists have agreed to sing hymns.

Hymns and hymn tunes have their independent history as much as psalms and psalm tunes. Mr. Bunsen's greater 'German Hymn Book' contains nearly 1000 hymns selected out of 150,000, of which about twenty belong to the Latin Church before the Reformation. For the use of his second (minor) edition, he has added the old Gregorian chants, for an alternate singing of the psalms by hemistichs by the choir and congregation, and a collection of 300 hymn tunes. Luther had himself translated about twelve Ambrosian hymns in the same metre, and, retaining the old tune,—among others the *Creator Spiritus* of Charlemagne's time. All who remember Arnold's Life (i. 363.) will remember the delight with which this selection was welcomed by him. We cannot give our readers a general idea of the subject in fewer words than in the following passage from Mr. Ernest Bunsen's preface to a selection of hymns in English with their church melodies, which he published two or three years ago for the benefit of the German Hospital in London.

'Hymnodic composition is based upon the old diatonic system of the original eight modes, wisely chosen for the Christian service by the Church of Milan, and then adopted by Rome, and through Rome by the whole Western Church. This system was at the time of the Reformation preserved and brought into congregational use with the power of genius, by Luther, and then developed and systematised by an illustrious class of first-rate composers, principally in Germany, but also in France and England. . . . The choral hymn has its own positive laws. It is not a popular air merely sobered down or restrained, it is a more elevated structure. . . . Its models are, in the first place, the compositions of the Western Church, from the fifth or sixth to the fifteenth century, altogether scarcely more than 150; in the second place, the German hymnodic airs from Luther and his friend Walther in an unbroken chain down to our own age: the number exceeding 2000.'

But an original hymn in the sight of the hotter Reformers of Geneva was man's work! and hymns, in order to become acceptable to them, had to put on the form of translated psalms. 'Calvin' (says Florimont de Rémond, in his 'History of Heresy,') '*eut le soin de mettre les psaumes de Marot et de Beze entre les mains des plus excellents musiciens qui fussent lors en la chrétienté: entre autres de Goudimel, et d'un autre nommé Bourgeois pour les coucher en musique.*' This being the case, we have only to recollect who Palestrina was, and learn that Goudimel had been his master, to raise our wonder at Warton's rashness in discrediting his 'History of English Poetry,' with the following account of the metrical psalmody introduced by Calvin:—'Calvin, intent as he was to form a new Church on a severe model, had yet too much sagacity to exclude every auxiliary to devotion. . . . Sensible that his chief resources were in the rabble of a republic, and availing himself of that natural propensity which prompts even vulgar

minds to express their more animated feelings in rhyme and music, he conceived a mode of universal psalmody, not too refined for common capacities and fitted to please the populace. The rapid propagation of Calvin's religion, and his numerous proselytes, are a strong proof of his address in planning such a sort of service. France and Germany were instantly infatuated with the love of psalm-singing, which being admirably calculated to kindle and diffuse the flame of fanaticism, was peculiarly serviceable to the purposes of faction, and frequently served as the trumpet to rebellion.' . . . 'Calvin's music was intended to correspond with the general parsimonious spirit of his worship; . . . the music he permitted was to be *without grace, elegance, or elevation*. These apt notes were about forty tunes, of one part only, and in one unisonous key.'*

What says Mr. Ernest Bunsen?—'Of the Reformed Church the psalm tunes composed by Goudimel and some of his school stand pre-eminent; but most of the metres to which they are adapted are complicated and peculiar to French poetry.' How far they are written 'without grace, elegance, or elevation,' the compositions themselves, still extant, are the best evidence. It is equally clear that so far from being designed and calculated for the mere 'rabble of a republic,' they were studiously prepared for a musically educated people. Warton is also in error in saying that these tunes were written 'in one part only': those which Bourgeois composed were published in 1561, and those supplied by Goudimel, in 1565, all being composed in four parts. In 1608 appeared 'Les Pseaumes de David, mis en musique à quatre et cinq parties, par Claudin le jeune.' This work was reprinted at Geneva, Leyden, and Amsterdam.

The growth and progress of congregational singing in the Protestant Churches on the Continent were straightforward; while its course in England was circuitous, and influenced by various and conflicting causes. The predilections of Queen Elizabeth, as head of the Church; the wishes and opinions of her chief advisers in all matters which concerned its government; the expectations and desires of the majority of her people, and their state of musical culture, all had to be taken into consideration. With regard to the first, there is no doubt that the Queen desired to retain in the ceremonies of the Church, as many of the externals of Popery as could be engrafted on a Protestant ritual. 'Elizabeth,' says Burnet, 'had been bred up from her infancy with a hatred of the Papacy and a love to the Reformation; but yet, as her first impressions in her father's reign were in favour of such old rites as he had still retained, so in her own nature she loved state, and some magnificence in religion as well as in every thing else.'* More especially, her love of music led her to retain, as far as was practicable, the performance of choir music. 'The musical service' [of the Church], says Heylyn, 'was admired and cherished by the Queen; for the Liturgy was officiated every day, both morning and evening, in the chapel, with the most excellent voices of men and children that could be got in all the kingdom, accompanied by the organ.'† The choir of the chapel royal, including its twenty-four clerical members, then consisted of sixty-two voices. So much for the Queen's personal choice and example in her own peculiar place of worship. The supremacy recognised in the Crown would secure to the royal chapel and its form of service a similar authority to what the papal chapel had exercised before. Marbeck was one of its members in 1550, when he published his 'Book of Common Praier, noted.' He describes it, as containing 'so much of the Common Praier, as is to be sung in churches:' and its adoption 'on the whole, as the authentic choral book of the Church, so far as the alterations of the service permitted,' is considered by Mr. Dyce to be placed beyond any doubt. 'It would complete an *antiphonarium* for the reformed liturgy.'

On the other hand, Elizabeth's choice of her religious advisers was dictated by the same acuteness, which in every other important exercise of sovereign power she habitually displayed. She consulted policy and prudence rather than personal preferences. Parker, Grindal, and Jewel were among the most eminent confessors and exiles of the preceding reign. Of Parker's sentiments concerning the introduction of metrical psalmody into the Church Service, we shall have occasion to speak immediately. Grindal and Jewel, recently members of the Reformed Church at Frankfort, where congregational singing was considered as one of the distinguishing features of Protestantism, and whose dislike to the habits and ceremonies which Elizabeth sought to retain, was with considerable difficulty overcome, contended for a practice which every Reformed Church had agreed to adopt, of which Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Bucer, and Beza had been all equally the advocates, and which had become interwoven with the very frame and order of Protestant worship.

That a large proportion of the English

* Hist. of English Poetry, 8vo edit. vol. iii. pp. 448. 455.

* Hist. Reformation, Part. II. p. 376.
† Ecclesiastical History, p. 296.

people desired the introduction of metrical psalmody in particular into the Church Service, there can be no question. Elizabeth succeeded to the crown in November, 1558; a few months afterwards, Bishop Jewel, writing to his friend Peter Martyr, says,—'A change now appeared among the people. Nothing promoted it more visibly than the inviting the people to sing psalms. That was begun in one church in London, and did quickly spread itself not only through the City, but in the neighbouring places. Sometimes at Paul's Cross there will be 6000 people singing. This was very grievous to the Papists.*' With them, therefore, in that age psalm-singing and heresy were synonymous; but what an imposing spectacle! There can also be no doubt that the Cathedral Service was held in abhorrence by many persons within as well as without the pale of the Church. The Puritans, in their Confessions, p. 1571., say,—'Concerning the singing of psalms, we allow of the people's joining with one voice in a plain tune, but not of tossing the psalms from one side to the other, with intermingling of organs.'† What was the plain tune here intended by the Puritans? Probably, the new kind of plain song or metrical psalmody of the Genevan reformers; on the other hand, the 'modest and distinct song' of Elizabeth's Injunction, and the 'plain song' of Heylyn, represented the more moderate innovations, as publicly agreed to by the Church of England, and will most likely have been some one of the ancient ecclesiastical melodies or intonations. These plain tunes were so called, in distinction from the figured music —*vibratam illam et operosam musicam*— which, in his *Reformatio legum*, Cranmer had wished to proscribe, of which two popes (John XXII. and Pius V.) had also disapproved, and which was preserved only by the genius of Palestrina. Among the most prominent and powerful opponents of the Cathedral Service in the Establishment were the Queen's Professor at Oxford, the Margaret Professor at Cambridge, and Whyttingham, Dean of Durham. All the Protestant dissidents of the time favoured congregational, in opposition to choir singing; and those ministers of the Church of England who, during the persecutions of Mary, had sought refuge abroad, were found, on this point, closely associated with the Nonconformists. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the majority of Elizabeth's Protestant subjects regarded her desire to keep up the Cathedral Service in its full splendour as an evidence of her leaning towards Popery, that many of them desired its entire abolition, and still more of them countenanced the substitution of that universal symbol and badge of Protestantism, congregational singing in one form or another.

But were the English people prepared to effect this change, and to substitute the singing of the congregation for that of the choir —were they, like their German, Swiss, and Flemish brethren, *singers*, not by ear, but from notes? The answer is, they were. At no period of English history was the cultivation of the vocal art so universal as in the reign of Elizabeth. We need not adduce the oft-quoted testimony of Morley; but the copious supply of madrigals during this period is a sufficient evidence of the musical attainments and the musical wants of the English people. Every person who had received any other kind of education, had also received a musical education, and was able to read notes as well as words. The compositions of Byrd, Gibbons, Wilbye, Bennett, Bateson, Morley, and their contemporaries, were everywhere sung; the choicest madrigals of Italy and Flanders were imported and translated; and thus musical knowledge and musical taste were diffused throughout England to an extent of which we have now no idea. Congregational singing could not have been planted in a more congenial soil.

The result of the above conflicting forces will be seen in the Forty-ninth of the Queen's 'Injunctions,' 1559, which prescribes the mode in which music should be used in the Church. 'For the encouragement and the continuance of the use of singing in the Church of England, it is enjoined, that is to say, that whereas in divers collegiate, and some other churches, heretofore there hath been livings appointed for the maintenance of men and children for singing in the Church, by means of which the laudable exercise of music hath been had in estimation and preserved in knowledge. The Queen's

* Strype observes from his diary, that in Sept. 1559. 'began the new morning prayer at St. Antholin's, London, the bell beginning to ring at five, when *a psalm was sung after the Geneva fashion;* all the congregation,—men, women, and boys,—singing together.' Again, March 3, 1560, 'Grindal, the new bishop of London, preached at St. Paul's Cross, in his rochet and chimere (cymar), the mayor and aldermen present, and a great auditory. And after sermon a psalm was sung (which was the common practice of the Reformed Churches abroad), wherein the people also joined their voices.' The congregational singing of Marot's psalms was equally popular in France. Dyer relates, in his Life of Calvin, 1557, that a crowd of from 5000 to 6000 persons, among whom were the King and Queen of Navarre, assembled every evening in the *Pré aux Clercs* for that purpose; nor would the Parliament of Paris interfere. Only fancy the Parisians congregating now to sing psalms in the *Champs Elysées!*

† Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, p. 290.

Majesty, neither meaning in any wise the decay of any endowment that might tend to the use and continuance of the said science, willeth and commandeth that no alteration be made in the disposition of such assignments as have been heretofore appointed to the use of singing in the Church, but that all such do remain: that there be a *modest and distinct song, so used in all the common prayers of the Church as that the same may be plainly understood.* And yet, nevertheless, for the comforting of such as take delight in music, it be permitted that, either at morning or evening prayer, there be sung *a hymn or such like song*, to the praise of Almighty God, in the best melody and music that may be conveniently devised.' 'According to which order,' says Heylyn, 'as *plain song was retained in most parish churches*, so in the Queen's own chapels, and in the quire of all Cathedrals, and some Colleges, the hymns were sung after a more melodious manner, commonly with organs.'

It may be argued, and indeed has been, that these passages contain no specific and distinct sanction for congregational singing; and concerning the other more apparent novelty of the Reformation or psalm singing, Elizabeth's Injunction, it has been also argued, contains neither direction nor permission for the use of any metrical version of the Psalter. But, on the point of express authority, it would be as hard to find there, or elsewhere, any sanction, since the Reformation, for the antiphonal chanting of the Psalms. Heylyn's account of the course taken with the Marot and Beza of the Church of England, is as follows:—'About this time (1552) the Psalms of David did first begin to be composed in English metre by Thomas Sternhold; who, translating no more than thirty-seven, left both example and encouragement to John Hopkins to dispatch the rest; which, notwithstanding being first allowed for private devotion, they were, by little and little, brought into the use of the Church; permitted, rather than allowed to be sung; afterwards printed and bound up with the Common Prayer Book, and, at last, added by the stationers at the end of the Bible.'

Now this was precisely the sort of sanction which it accorded with Elizabeth's prepossessions and feelings to give—and no other. Her very title to the crown rested on her renunciation of Papal authority. But if policy inclined, nay compelled her to take the side of Protestantism, her inclinations were often in favour of Popish usages. Of toleration, or the rights of conscience, she had as little care or understanding as any sovereign of her age. She reluctantly banished the crucifix and the altar from parish churches: they lingered, however, in her own chapel for many years after their public disuse, to the great grief and scandal of her Protestant subjects, who rightly contended that an altar could only consist with the notion of a sacrifice of Christ in the Mass. In her wish to retain the various dresses worn by the Romish priests in the celebration of the various offices of their religion, she in part succeeded; and from her desire to enforce celibacy on the clergy she kept the law in a state, which enabled her, while under the roof of Archbishop Parker, to insult his wife. If, from policy, therefore, Elizabeth was allied to Protestantism, she had few Protestant feelings or sympathies,—while to Puritanism, and to Nonconformity of every kind and class, she cherished an inveterate aversion. Hence it was not likely that, in terms, she should recognise, still less sanction, what had been made a characteristic badge of Calvinistic worship, the use of metrical psalmody, or even the general substitution of congregational for choir singing. All that could be expected, was that sort of compromise which the injunction concerning the use of music in churches virtually contained.

But if we look to the practical effect of this injunction, we shall find that it was precisely such as would have ensued from a distinct approval of the use of metrical psalmody. The version of Sternhold and Hopkins was printed by the Queen's printer, and bound up and circulated with the Bible and the Prayer Book, while the tunes were furnished by the organist and choirmen of her own chapel. When the Prayer Book was completed, A. D. 1559, to the celebrated Thomas Tallis was assigned the charge of giving musical expression to all those portions of the Liturgy which were to be sung in cathedrals and collegiate churches. We are not left here to conjecture; we have the entire Service which Tallis wrote, and as he wrote it. The directions 'priest' and 'choir,' 'decani' (the side of the dean) and 'cantoris' (the side of the precentor): occur throughout. It is a composition, from its very structure, designed for an antiphonal choir, and incapable of being sung by a congregation. Heard to this day with unabated delight, it is unnecessary to say how admirably this task was accomplished; but in connexion with the present subject it must be especially remarked that Tallis was also one of the earliest contributors to our metrical psalmody, being then, as he had been from the reign of Henry VIII., a member of the Chapel Royal. The English Cathedral Service, or singing by a choir,—

and English Congregational singing, with the use of metrical psalmody, came therefore, not from different and opposite sources, but from the same. Many Psalm-tunes have a pedigree not much inferior to any other portion of sacred music.

A metrical version of the Psalms by Sternhold, Hopkins, and Whyttingham had been printed before Elizabeth's accession to the throne. But three years after that time there appeared 'The whole Psalmes, in Foure Partes, which may be sung to all Musical Instrumentes; set forth for the Encrease of Vertue, and abolishyng of other vayne and triflyng Ballads. Imprinted at London, by John Daye. Cum Gratia et Privilegio Regiæ Majestatis per Septennium.'* One of the contributors to this work was Tallis. In 1567 Archbishop Parker published the first translation by one and the same person of the entire Psalter into English metre. It was printed at London by John Daye, with the royal privilege, and appended to it are eight Psalm-tunes, sufficing in metre and in character, as was supposed, for every individual Psalm. This version of the Psalms deserves especial notice, not only from its extreme rarity, (the copy to which we have had access is in the library of Corp. Christ. Coll. Cambridge,) but because it was published by the highest Dignitary of the Church,—the music being supplied by the most eminent composer of the time, who was also the head or chief of the Queen's choir in her chapel. Warton's notice of it is in the following terms, and more errors were never before or since crowded into the same space: 'Some of our musical antiquaries have justly conjectured that the Archbishop intended these psalms, which are adapted to complicated tunes of four parts, probably constructed by himself, and here given in score, for the use of cathedrals, at a time when compositions in counterpoint were uncommon in the Church, and when that part of our choir service called the Motet or Anthem, which admits of a more artful display of harmony (and which is recommended in Queen Elizabeth's earliest ecclesiastical Injunctions) was yet almost unknown, or in a very imperfect state.' †

The conjecture is without a shadow of authority or probability, the tunes being adapted for congregational, not choir singing. They are not 'complicated,' but simple. They were not 'constructed by himself' (Parker), but by Tallis, whose name is affixed to them. They are not 'in score,' but in four separate and distinct parts, according to the custom of the time. 'Compositions in counterpoint' were so far from being 'uncommon' then, that no other were in existence. There is no part of the choir service called the 'Motet;' and the Anthem was not distinguished for, nor did it admit, 'a more artful display of harmony' than the regular morning or evening service. In fact, canons of the most artful kind occur frequently in the Services of our great composers (see those of Purcell, Gibbons, Croft, and Blow), but in Anthems very rarely. That the Anthem was very far from being 'unknown' we have sufficient evidence in the few compositions of this kind and age which have fortunately survived. So little is Warton to be trusted when he has to speak of music.

How general was the practice of congregational singing of psalms at this time may be surmised from the following enumeration of the works adapted for this purpose:—

In 1579, John Daye published 'The Psalmes of David in English meter, with Notes of Foure Parts, &c.' In 1585, 'Musike of Six and Five Parts, made upon the common Tunes used in singing the Psalmes, by John Cosyn.' In 1591, 'The former Booke of the Musike of Mr. William Damon, late one of her Majestie's Musitions, containing all the Tunes of David's Psalmes, as they are ordinarily soung in the Church, most excellently by him composed into Foure Partes.' In 1592, 'The whole Booke of Psalmes, with their wonted Tunes as they are sung in Churches, composed into Foure Parts: all which are so placed that Foure may sing eche one a several Part in this Book. Compiled by sundry Authors, who have so laboured herein, that the Unskillful may, with small Practice, attaine to sing that Part which is fittest for their Voice.' This compilation numbers among its contributors Dowland, Farmer, Kirby, Allison, Blancks, Hooper, Cobbold, and Cavendish, all of them otherwise known as men of eminence in this age of England's musical greatness. These various Collections of psalm-tunes, all of which were published in at least four parts, were exactly adapted to the wants as well as the musical attainments of the age. Whatever was done was well done, and the talents of the best composers were enlisted, in order to give value and currency to each several publication. There cannot be stronger evidence of the different state of musical culture in England then and

* The only known perfect copy of this, the earliest collection of Psalm-tunes published in England, is in the library of Dr. Rimbault, to whose labours English musicians are largely indebted as the editor of several of the valuable works printed by the Musical Antiquarian Society.

† Hist. of English Poetry, vol. iii. (edit. 1840) 161.

now, than is afforded by comparing these collections of Psalm-tunes with those which are the most popular at present. At present, Rippon's has probably the largest permanent sale, notwithstanding (perhaps we ought to say, because) it abounds the most in trash. Yet, the collections we have enumerated went through several editions in their time. Daye's volume having been reprinted by the University of Cambridge, this was regarded as an infringement of his patent, and the heads of the colleges petitioned Lord Burghley, their Chancellor, (July 16. 1591: *Strype's Annals,*) to protect them from any proceedings consequent upon their alleged piracy.

In 1621 Thomas Ravenscroft published 'The whole Booke of Psalmes, &c., composed into Four Parts, by sundry Authors, to such severall Tunes, as have been and usually are sung in England, Scotland, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands.' But when Ravenscroft published this collection, the decline of musical knowledge and musical taste had commenced. A Stuart had succeeded to the throne, and from every one of that wretched family the English musician experienced at best neglect and indifference,—oftener opprobrium, injustice, and proscription. The art and practice of part-singing fell off so rapidly that the number of madrigals which, year after year, had enriched the age of Elizabeth, soon ceased after the accession of James I. Ten years sufficed to put an entire and final period to the labours of the twenty-two musicians who had united, in 1602, to celebrate the praises of their Queen in the 'Triumphs of Oriana.' Ravenscroft's volume is, nevertheless, a valuable addition to the previous collection of psalm-tunes. Availing himself of the labours of his predecessors, he added to them his own, as well as those of Morley, Bennett, Ward, Tomkins, Peirson, and John Milton, the poet's father. Up to this time, therefore, it is established that psalm-singing was no rude and barbarous noise, but a part of public worship, supplied, in well-constructed harmony, by the best musicians of England's proudest musical era, for a musically-educated people. Every existing publication bears testimony to this fact.

In 1537 George Sandys, the traveller, published his metrical version of the Psalms, for which Henry Lawes wrote twenty tunes in two parts; and in 1648 Lawes published thirty short anthems in three parts, written by himself and his brother William, to portions of Sandys's version. In the latter publication (now very rare) is found, for the first time, Milton's sonnet 'To his Friend, Henry Lawes,' composed but three years before. During the time of the Commonwealth, the musical part of public worship is thus noticed in the Directory which was prepared by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster:—'It is the duty of Christians to praise God publickly by the singing of psalms, together in the congregation and also privately in the family. In singing of psalms the voice is to be tuneably ordered, but the chief care must be to sing with understanding, making melody unto the Lord with the heart as with the voice.'

After the Restoration, the music of the parochial service partook of the general corruption of the age. Charles silenced the organ of his chapel, and supplied its place by a band of French fiddlers, while he thrust all English musicians from his presence* with insult and contumely,—Purcell, Humphries, and Blow among the rest. The state of music in the service of the parish church is thus described by John Playford, in the preface to his 'Psalms and Hymns in solemn Music of Foure Parts on the common Tunes to the Psalms in Metre; 1671':—'For many years this part of divine service was skilfully and devoutly performed: and it is still continued in our churches, but not with that reverence and estimation as formerly. The tunes formerly used to the psalms are, for excellency of form, solemn ayre, and suitableness to the matter of the psalms, not inferiour to any tunes used in foreign churches; but at this day the best and almost all the choice tunes are out of use in our churches. Nor must we expect it otherwise when in and about this great city, in above one hundred parishes, but few parish clerks are to be found that have either ear or understanding to set one of those tunes as it ought to be, whereby this part of God's service hath been so ridiculously performed in most places that it is brought into scorn and derision.' Another corruption of parochial psalmody ensued—though not necessarily—upon the introduction of organs, which now began to be built in some of the larger parish churches. Every tune was introduced by a long prelude, and every line of the psalm severed from the next by an interlude, generally of four bars. Some of these impertinent addenda are in existence, and they might seem to be constructed on purpose to render this part of the service as ridiculous as Playford represents it.

The next collection of Psalm-tunes which it is proper to notice, immediately followed the publication of Tate and Brady's version of the Psalms. To this collection, which

* See the Diaries of Pepys and Evelyn.

appeared in 1704, Purcell, Jer. Clark, Dr. Blow, and Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Croft were contributors: from that time to the present valuable additions to our stock of metrical psalmody have been very rare. It is true, the number of published collections has been endless, but they have been, generally, either incorrect or vulgarised reprints of old tunes, or more incorrect and vulgar new ones. Few musicians of eminence have cared to concern themselves with a branch of their art so degraded and profitless: no well-directed effort has been made to regain for the music of the parish church its true character and former excellence; and that part of the service which might be rendered impressive and delightful, is now a universal nuisance.

This rapid review of the origin, intent, and use of music, as applied in this country to the service of the Church, will show that the two modes of its employment, once severally indicative of Popery and Protestantism, were both of them adopted, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, into the service of the Reformed Church of England; that Choir singing was supposed to be confined to Cathedrals, collegiate churches and some collegiate chapels having assignments with that object, while Congregational singing was introduced on system, though by degrees, into Parochial churches; that the two modes of thus employing sacred music were, in point of time, contemporary; that the music for the parish church as well as that for the cathedral were both supplied, for the most part, by the same composers, these being chiefly servants of the Sovereign, and daily engaged in the chapel royal; that the most eminent of our musicians long continued not only to produce services and anthems for cathedrals, but psalm-tunes for parish churches; and that the subsequent decay of parochial psalmody has been gradual, ending in the substitution of a single voice or a parish choir for the singing of the congregation, and a generally debased style of parochial psalmody, as well as in the perversion and loss of its true character.

The wretched state of music in our parish churches is undisputed; and exhortations without number have issued from the pulpit and the press calling for its amendment. But vague exhortations are of little avail. We must have a definite view of the object to be sought, as well as of the best means of attaining it, before we are in a condition to enter upon the work. We must see our way clearly, if we would tread firmly or even safely. We must accurately discern and understand the use and design of the two modes in which music was intended to aid public devotion, as well as the proper methods for their respective employment.

Music is the language of the Cathedral: the entire Liturgy is recited to musical tones, the responses are all made in correct harmony, the priest intones the Preces, and by prescribed sounds leads the choir from key to key; the psalms are chanted antiphonally, and the *Te Deum Jubilate*, and the greater hymns of the Church (sung to the music of some eminent composer) always require the assistance of two responsive, well-instructed, and well-balanced choirs. Every such composition, from the time of Tallis downward, has been constructed with a reference to this arrangement. The Cathedral Service is one perfect and beautiful whole, designed with admirable judgment, and worked out with consummate knowledge. It commences with the single voice of the priest, intoning the introductory sentence and the exhortation, while the voices of the two choirs combine in harmony on the 'Amen.' Presently, and before the ear is wearied, the reciting note is changed, the Preces are chanted to a varied succession of sounds, and the responses to a more varied harmony. The accompanied chant succeeds, the organ aiding, for the first time, the musical effect; choir replies to choir, 'while the skilful organist plies his grave or fancied descant' as the words of the psalm suggest it. Then peals in the full-voiced *Gloria Patri*. This climax attained, the voice of music, for a space, ceases—the first lesson is read, and there follows some noble *Te Deum* of Tallis, Farrant, or Gibbons. The second lesson succeeds, and the *Jubilate* of one of these choice composers is heard. The priest again intones the prayers, and at the appointed time 'followeth the Anthem' —some admirable exposition of the musician's skill, feeling, and piety—the solemnity of Byrd, the majesty of Gibbons, the magic expression of Purcell, the deep and touching pathos of Clarke, the grandeur of Croft, or the grace of Battishill. The Cathedral Service, therefore, in itself is a perpetually increasing and extending development of the power of music as an aid to devotion, reaching at length the highest triumph of which the art is capable, and 'bringing all heaven before the eyes.' What avarice, ignorance, and indolence have degraded it to in actual performance at the present day, is another affair. No well-instructed musician, clerical or lay, has ever attempted any innovation in our cathedral music. Aldrich, Creyghton, and Tucker, of the former class, as well as Purcell, Croft, and Boyce, fit representatives of the latter, have set the seal of their approbation upon it. And this becoming

admiration of the Cathedral Service has been displayed by a late able contributor to it in his works and in his words—'Let us have new cathedral music' says Dr. Crotch, 'but no new style.' Authority and experience therefore concur in assuring us that it cannot be touched without injury, and that all attempts to change its essential characteristics, whether by reading instead of chanting the Service, by reducing the numbers of the choirs, and thus excluding the finest compositions, by introducing fragments of the light and operatic music of the Romish Church,—or, on the other hand, by endeavouring to transplant detached portions of it into the service of the parish church,—are equally unauthorised, unseemly, and improper. Innovations and abuses of the former kind have usually resulted from rapacity and dishonesty; those of the latter class are commonly the offspring of ignorance, conceit, and folly.

The musical annals of a parish have seldom been encouraging. The minister of a parish church in some populous town, wholly ignorant of the history, intent, and character of Church music, as well as of the art itself, as boldly as blindly assumes the character of a musical reformer. He gets up a choir; directs them to endeavour to chant a certain portion of the Service, just what and as much as he pleases—sometimes they are told to essay the singing of an anthem—anything, in short, which shall tend to render the 'performance,' as he thinks and hopes, striking. Another clergyman, perhaps in the adjoining church, desires to surpass the musical efforts of his neighbour, whose choir has been directed to restrict their chanting (as it is called) to the Psalms. This more ambitious divine ordains that the responses also shall be chanted, although himself unable to chant the Preces; he commands also the Te Deum and Jubilate to be sung. Here, perhaps, the members of his choir encounter a difficulty, the choral services of Gibbons, Croft, Aldrich, or Child, not being on a level with their vocal attainments—possibly not suited to his own taste. At any rate, it seems a chaotic sort of affair in their hands. Our reformers know not why, but so it is. They want something more pretty, more modern, more attractive. And there is no difficulty in obtaining it; for music of this kind is always to be had in any quantity and at any price. Thus is the sublime and perfect Service of the Cathedral made a thing of shreds and patches, debased in character, and ridiculous in execution, the road to real improvement forsaken, and the true design and purpose of Parochial music left utterly aside.

It is sometimes attempted to justify this jumble of Cathedral and Parochial music, by certain directions which occur in the Book of Common Prayer, such as 'to be said or sung,' and 'in quires and places where they sing, here followeth the Anthem.' Had the framers of our Liturgy contemplated the use which is now sought to be made of these expressions, they would probably have given their directions with greater explicitness; but in order to understand their import aright, we must revert to the other injunctions respecting the use of music in the Church, and especially to the distinction marked out and subsisting between the music of the Cathedral and that of the Parish Church. The import of the latter direction is that 'In quires and places where *the quire* sing, here followeth the Anthem.' In parish churches there was no 'quire;' and, therefore, in such cases the direction is inapplicable. A 'quire' meant, not a row of singers, good or bad, here to-day and gone to-morrow; but the minor canons and lay clerks of a cathedral, a fixed and defined number of voices permanently engaged and daily occupied in the performance of its service. To cathedrals, collegiate churches and chapels, therefore, was the direction intended to apply. So, 'to be said or sung' meant in the absence of a quire,' 'to be *said*;' or where a 'quire,' properly so called, existed, then 'to be *sung*.' We have heard of a clergyman who, adhering to the *ipsissima verba*, used to sing his portion of the Athanasian Creed to the tune of a hunting song: and in case this lax interpretation be allowed, he must stand acquitted of having violated the direction, however much he might have sinned against decency and propriety. That the singing of anthems in parish churches was never contemplated by the framers of our Liturgy, is further confirmed by the fact of their having always been accompanied by the organ, an instrument then only found where a 'quire' existed. Parish churches had no organs. So recent, by comparison, has been their introduction into parish churches, that in the county of Norfolk, which contains eight hundred parishes, fifty years since there were only six organs, including that of Norwich Cathedral. It is this novel interpretation of the liturgical direction, which has led to the production and performance of those compounds of vulgarity, imbecility, and absurdity, miscalled Anthems, such as at present form the pride and delight of country choirs.

So far has this heedless spirit of innovation been carried, that in not a few parish churches it has been attempted to introduce what is called 'congregational chanting;' a practice of which the absurdity has been

properly exposed by Dr. Jebb:—'The musical tone being the main feature of the Cathedral Service, it remains to consider the form in which it is developed—the Cathedral Chant. Now this is *essentially* antiphonal. This character is presumed through the entire Prayer Book, and enters into the combinations, however diversified, of every chant and service, and of most anthems. If this principle be recognised, it will be apparent what injury it must suffer by the modern and inconsistent practice of a partial adoption of the chant. For such a practice there is no authority; while on every other ground it is utterly indefensible. If every dean or parish priest shall assume a license to disturb and distrust the form of the Church Service, what hope is there that a regard for any other obligation will be observed? . . . . Much has been said of what is called "congregational chanting," a phrase which could only have originated in ignorance of the subject, historically as well as musically regarded. If such a practice were attempted, our musicians need give themselves no further trouble about harmony, which had better be suppressed altogether. Melody too should be abandoned; in short, all pretence at choral service it would be advisable to give up. Nothing is so difficult as to chant well—nothing is more beautiful than the service thus performed—nothing more ludicrous than the attempt of a congregation to scramble through it.'* Were the knowledge acquired, it would still take a generation or more to get our devotional thoughts and habits into the new channel.

The only effectual means of improving the musical portion of the parochial service will be found in a recurrence to the principle on which it is based, and to the practice which was in accordance with that principle. It may be said that this would demand a state of musical culture similar to that which existed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and doubtless, in order to attain its full and due effect, a more general knowledge of the vocal art must be diffused. But, in case we can credit newspaper accounts of certain periodical exhibitions at Exeter and St. Martin's Halls, this must have been, in no small degree, already attained. If the effect of the 'system' about which so much has been said and written is not visible, or rather audible, in our places of worship, where are we to look for it? Making every allowance for partial exaggeration, we may surely assume that the power of reading from notes has been considerably extended within the last ten years, and that our means of really improving the music of the parish church are progressively increasing.

It should be the especial care of the clergy to avail themselves of these means judiciously and effectively, to induce a love of this inspiring portion of public worship, and to encourage a general desire to aid in it. If it were possible to hear some of the fine psalm-tunes of our old masters sung, as of yore, 'in foure parts,' by two or three hundred assembled worshippers, little need be added in the way of exhortation and appeal. The effect on the ear, and still more on the heart, would be decisive. Such effects are realised in Protestant Germany; and why not in Protestant England?

Meantime, the aid of the clergy, to be useful, must be given in the right direction, and guided by some knowledge of the subject. But not one clergyman in a thousand thinks it desirable to add to his other acquirements at a university any knowledge of music; although Cambridge and Oxford ought to be eminently the schools of sound musical education. Each University has its musical professor, whose duty it is, and whose practice it formerly was, to give such instruction as the future clergyman will most want. Even Cromwell took care that Dr. Wilson, the Oxford professor of music, regularly gave his music lecture.* This spring of knowledge, if not dried up, is at least disused: though Oxford and Cambridge have still their choirs, indeed scanty and incompetent when compared with their former numbers and attainments; and they have still their musical libraries, unrivalled in England. The machine is in existence; let its rust be rubbed off, and let it be once more set to work: what it once did, it can do again. But until our clergy have acquired the requisite knowledge, let them refrain from any attempt at innovation. They may be sure that the musical service of the Church was not appointed and divided by chance, but was the result of sound knowledge and mature judgment; and that the parties by whom alone it can be successfully broken in upon and reformed, must know what they are about as well as those did who formed the system first.

We have already mentioned that the Reformed Churches of Germany and Holland have of late exchanged metrical psalms for

* Jebb's Choral Service of the Church of England.

* Passed over by Warton, in his partial account of the Oxford Music School during the Commonwealth See the note upon Henry Lawes prefixed to Comus, in Warton's edition of Milton's minor poems (p. 132). Where Calvinists or Republicans are concerned, Warton was too prejudiced to be just ar accurate.

hymns. In case we should ever propose following their example, we must give our people better hymns and—what is equally important—better schoolmasters, competent to teach their scholars how to sing them. The subject is important at present, both in a religious and political point of view. The semi-Romanists among us must be prevented from depriving the congregation of one of the best and most living elements of the national worship, and from reducing the congregation, even in our parochial churches, by means of anthems and intonations, to the condition of simple assistants, as far as singing is concerned, of a sort of mass in English. When hymns and hymn tunes are provided, it will be still indispensable that the people should be taught. Here every thing depends on the schoolmaster. Can men brought up at St. Mark's, and similar institutions of the National Society, be relied on for this purpose? Can an almost exclusive training in sacerdotal performances, invented and used to exclude congregational singing, as a Protestant nuisance, be a good preparation for it? Next, supposing bishops, deans, and chapters not to be wanting in good will, do they understand enough of music to bear their part in this reform?

The publications which stand at the head of this article indicate an increased attention to the history and character of English psalmody, and they also illustrate its state at their different periods. The first, a reprint in score of Est's extremely rare and valuable collection, has been issued by a Society, whose exertions have rescued from impending destruction so many interesting and valuable composition of the Elizabethan age. The second is a reprint of Ravenscroft's collection (of which the original edition is not less rare than that of Est), by a clergyman whose knowledge of music has been sufficiently evidenced in his various contributions to the cathedral as well as the parochial service. The third presents a more extended and diversified epitome of psalmody in different countries, and through successive epochs; comprising some of the best psalm-tunes of the English school, from the time of Tallis to the present day, chorals of Bach and other eminent German musicians, and those also of the Genevan and other foreign Protestant Churches.

Art. V.—*Assemblée Nationale Legislative.* Projet de loi relatif à une Convention littéraire entre la France et la Grande-Bretagne, précédé de l'exposé des motifs présenté par M. Turgot, Ministre des Affaires Etrangère. 11 Nov., 1851.

Although literary theft is carried on more or less in every country possessed of a reading public,—in France by the reprints of English novels, in England by the appropriation of French plays, and in America and Belgium by the reproduction of almost every thing that the intellectual industry of the two other countries produces,—we believe that Belgium is now the only nation which is not thoroughly ashamed of the practice, and in which public men have been found to uphold openly the right of piracy. There, indeed, a party exists which, under pretence of cheap diffusion of knowledge, defends the *contrefaçon* trade, as a lawful branch of national industry, and inveighs against authors who expect a remuneration for their labours, and against publishers who purchase copyrights, denouncing them as 'monopolists.'*

England and France, and even America, though somewhat tardily, have at length concurred in the necessity of putting a stop to a state of things which, in the case of original works, injures authors in exact proportion to the services they render to the public, and, in the case of translations, has the effect of depriving that public of many valuable foreign works. It is well known, that for some time past no publisher in this country could afford to pay an adequate price for a good translation, there being no copyright in such cases. The result was, that competent scholars shrank from undertaking the ungrateful, though meritorious task, and that England has been overrun with bad versions of books which would have deserved better treatment.

The general public has with great difficulty been brought to recognise the justice and policy of allowing the rights of foreign authorship, and thereby securing the claims of our own writers and publishers abroad. There was a vulgar impression in the world, that publishers were men who made a great deal of money from other people's labours, and that authors were men who did not re-

* We borrow this curious expression from a memorial addressed to the Belgian Minister of Commerce. The deputation which presented it was headed by M. Cans, a member for Brussels, and moreover a partner in the great house of Meline and Cans, the chief manufactory of spurious editions in Brussels. According to this theory, any man who buys a house or marries a wife, might be termed a monopolist.

quire money at all. They wrote books, it was supposed, as bees made honey, because it was their nature to do so, and for work's sake. Every reader thought, that, if *he* could write, he would like it very much, and, in fact, considered all pecuniary remuneration as clear gain, where no tangible capital was expended. The publishers, it is true, did advance money out of pocket, but what then?—they make *such* profits! In short, the idea, that in buying a Brussels or Leipsic edition of an English work they were receiving stolen goods, never seemed to enter the heads of our Continental tourists.

Where any particular kind of interest remains unprotected by law, public opinion is almost sure to become diseased, and to withdraw even its protection, at least in the quarters most open to temptation. This has been the case under our absurd Game Laws, and in some degree in the case both of copyright and patent, under our slow and inadequate recognition of a property in ideas. Subjects even of the same state, who would venture on violating no right guarded by the criminal law, violate this during the short existence allowed it, yet apparently grudged it, under a sort of compromise by the civil law. What wonder then that a just and honourable feeling on this subject has been long in growing up between nation and nation, notwithstanding the odious name of piracy?

Singularly enough, too, the invincible army which wields the pen, and to whose efforts the removal of almost every abuse may in the present day be traced, has rarely shown for the defence of its own interests that energy which it has so often displayed in more unselfish causes. Men have written on the Rights of Labour, or the Laws of Property, who seemed scarcely aware that they themselves possessed the only property under the sun which no law protected from foreign robbery, and that the fruits of their labour were at the mercy of every pirate, provided the robber was not a fellow-subject. Even in the present day, writers, whose sole object in life seems to be to wage war on unequal taxation in every shape, appear quite unconscious that they belong to the most heavily taxed class of the community, and, while rebelling against imports on windows or sugars, tamely submit to that accumulation of burdens designated by abuse-hunters under the general name of 'Taxes on Knowledge.' The first stir in the international copyright question came from the publishers; but the monstrous iniquity, once placed fairly before the public, can scarcely fail to be done away with; for it must be said, to the honour of the present age, that, when a thing is once proved to be unjust, its doom is sealed. There is, it is true, in some instances, an unaccountable but general fear of too speedy reforms,—a vague respect for vested rights in abuses, an idea that, if nations were too abruptly recalled to honest courses, some catastrophe might ensue, upon the same principle, we suppose, as we are told not to appease the hunger of a starving man too suddenly, or unguardedly expose frozen limbs to the heat of fire. Still, sooner or later, the abuse falls to the ground, and people wonder how it lasted so long. The repression of literary piracy seems likely to follow the usual course; the evil has been attacked in its minor branches first, leaving the root untouched. English authors and publishers are still robbed with impunity by the American pirates, and France continues to furnish gratis the only literature that Belgium enjoys; but, in 1846, England concluded with Prussia, and, in 1847, with Hanover, treaties which effectually secured the rights of literary property in those countries; while France, on her part, made similar conventions with the Governments of Sardinia and of Portugal. In short, as in all matters, those who made nothing by the evil practice were the first to condemn it; a truth which the conduct of Prussia has unblushingly displayed. Although, by its treaty with England, the cabinet of Berlin evidently recognised the justice of the claims of foreign authorship, it has not yet consented to conclude a similar convention with France, cheap French books (*i. e.* pirated editions from Brussels and Leipsic) being more necessary to Prussian enjoyment than English works of the same illegitimate origin. One did not require, however, to be very clearsighted to see that these conventions were only the forerunners of more important negotiations; and we are happy to say, that the question has recently taken a stride which promises its speedy final adjustment. The long-talked-of treaty between France and England was signed in Paris on the 3rd of November last by the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. Turgot, and our ambassador, Lord Normanby, on behalf of their respective Governments. The ratification of the Legislatures of both countries is, of course, necessary to give the convention a final sanction. As this is by far the most important of the copyright treaties hitherto concluded, and is likely to become a precedent in such matters, we think it may be interesting to lay before our readers its principal clauses.

Article the 1st (concerning which there cannot be two opinions among honest men) establishes that, from the date when the new